(b) It is not compulsory. There are several subordinates who do not contribute to it.

(c) Reminders were issued for the promised contribution, and they do not disprove its voluntary nature.

Mr. K. T. MATHEW.

If it is not compulsory, why did the Commissioner send reminders?

President—Reminders were sent only for the collection of money voluntarily promised.

Qualification of candidates selected for Police Training.

Mr. PAULO MAMPILLI.

49. Will the Government be pleased to state if there are not in the Police Department officers with the necessary qualifications who could have been selected for training?

SHEIK ABDUL QADIR SAHIB BAHADUR.

The member is referred to the answer to parts iii and iv of question No. 44.

Punishment of Sub-Inspectors by the Police Commissioner.

Mr. T. A. RAMACHANDRA AYYAR.

50. (a) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to an article in the "Yogakshemam" under the date 5th Thulam 1101 headed "അഭിനവബകൻ"?

(b) Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the fact that more than three Sub-Inspectors were punished departmentally since the advent of the present Commissioner of Police? Were any of the injured Police subordinates refused copies of papers connected with their investigation? Did any of them offer to stand a prosecution in a public court before being condemned and was that also refused?

Has the Commissioner of Police enquired into the matter referred to in para 1 of the question and if so, who is the party involved and what action was taken in the matter?

SHEIK ABDUL QADIR SAHIB BAHADUR.

(a) Yes.

(b) Yes. One was refused copies. None offered to stand a prosecution in a public court.

Yes. The party involved is the Head Constable in charge of Pattikkad Out-post. No action is proposed to be taken at

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

present as a case of assault and illegal confinement is pending trial before the Trichur Magistrate.

Mr. T. A. RAMACHANDRA AYYAR.

May I know whether the subordinates were refused copies of papers connected with their investigation?

SHEIK ABDUL QADIR SAHIB BAHADUR.

Yes, Sir. One of them was refused copies.

Mr. T. A. RAMACHANDRA AYYAR.

May I know why it was refused? Has justice been meted out by doing so?

SHEIK ABDUL QADIR SAHIB BAHADUR.

In a case of corruption, a witness was examined in the presence of the subordinate. His explanation was taken. Subsequenly, he asked for papers which contained depositions made by the witness in the presence of the subordinate. Copies of the punishment roll were given. He asked for copies of evidence taken against him. These were refused. If he wanted, he could have come to my office and perused them. He is not entitled to all the copies. If he wanted, he could have made a reference from the office with my permission. He is not entitled to the copies of all the depositions made in his presence.

Mr. T. A. RAMACHANDRA AYYAR.

Sir, I want a ruling to the effect that no copies of the depositions can be given.

President.—Whose ruling? The President's ruling? He is not entitled. It is left to the discretion of the Heads of Departments, and so it cannot be given.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly